

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/538,952	04/18/2006	Martin Griesser	AP 10597	9474
7590 09/03/2008 Gerlinde M Nattler			EXAMINER	
Craig Hallacher Continental Teves Inc One Continental Drive			PHAM, TOAN NGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Auburn Hills, MI 48326			2612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/538.952 GRIESSER ET AL Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Toan N. Pham 2612 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 11-28 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11-28 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 19 and 28 recites the limitation "wherein the one or more **other** system" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Objections

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 19 is dependent on the canceled claim 10. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Becherer et al. (US 6,591,668).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 11: Becherer et al. disclose a method for indirectly detecting the pressure loss based on the change in speed of the wheel (col. 2, lines 54-62); thus, the change in wheel speed is inherently the acceleration of the wheel. Becherer et al. also disclose the calculation of the wheel acceleration as one parameter for determining the pressure loss of the vehicle wheel (col. 32, lines 3-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becherer et al. (US 6,591,668).

Regarding claim 12: Becherer et al. does not disclose the straight line travel.

Becherer et al. disclose the parameter is taken when the wheel rotates. It would have been obvious that the straight line of travel is the normal driving condition; therefore, it is obvious and beneficial to measure the wheel condition during the normal straight line of travel.

Regarding claims 13 and 14: Becherer et al. disclose the comparison of the average wheel rotation velocity or their course within the time interval (col. 23, lines 57-67); thus, the average value is derived from the difference of the maximum and minimum value.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 15: Becherer et al. disclose the time intervals (col. 23, lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 16 and 17: Becherer et al. disclose the triggering of the alarm when the threshold limit is exceeded (col. 23, lines 64-67; col. 25, lines 28-35).

Regarding claim 18: Becherer et al. disclose the alarm is suppressed when a variety of situations is detected (col. 5, lines 8-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 20: The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Since the computer readable storage medium encoded with the computer code has not been claimed, the computer code as claimed is a computer listing per se (see MPEP 2106). Therefore the claimed computer code does not define any structural and functional interrelationship between the computer code and other claimed elements of a computer which permits the computer codes functionality to be realized.

Claims 21-28 are rejected for incorporating the above deficiency by dependency.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art of Lutz et al. (US 6,725,136), Latarnik et al. (US

Art Unit: 2612

6,909,949), Boesch et al. (US 5,721,528) and Wang (US 6,285,280) are cited to show a variety of vehicle wheel deflation detection systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan N. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2967. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Toan N Pham/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612 Application/Control Number: 10/538,952 Page 6

Art Unit: 2612